

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

February 16, 1967
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Absent: None

Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

Invocation was delivered by REVEREND JOHN BARCLAY, Central Christian Church.

Councilman White moved that the Minutes of January 12th and January 26th, 1967, be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on a map or plat of Elmhurst Heights, Section 3, a subdivision of a portion of the Santiago Del Valle Grant in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Elmhurst Heights, Section 3, of record in Book 9 at Page 115 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas, and as shown on a map or plat of Elmhurst Heights, Section 1, a subdivision of a portion of the Santiago Del Valle Grant in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Elmhurst Heights, Section 1, of record in Book 7 at Page 52 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas, a certain street, extending from Elmhurst Drive in a southerly direction to the north line of Taylor Gaines Street, is designated as Elmhurst East; and,

WHEREAS, the owners of lots abutting the hereinafter described street have requested that the name of Elmhurst East be changed to Elmhurst Drive;

Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the name of the following described street, designated as Elmhurst East, as the same appears on the maps of Elmhurst Heights, Section 3 and Elmhurst Heights, Section 1, be and the same is hereby changed to Elmhurst Drive, said street so changed being described as follows:

All that certain street in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, known as Elmhurst East, as shown on a map or plat of Elmhurst Heights, Section 3, a subdivision of a portion of the Santiago Del Valle Grant in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Elmhurst Heights, Section 3, of record in Book 9 at Page 115 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas, and as shown on a map or plat of Elmhurst Heights, Section 1, a subdivision of a portion of the Santiago Del Valle Grant in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, according to a map or plat of said Elmhurst Heights, Section 1, of record in Book 7 at Page 52 of the Plat Records of Travis County, Texas; which certain street to be changed from Elmhurst East to Elmhurst Drive extends from Elmhurst Drive in a southerly direction to the north line of Taylor Gaines Street.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"Sealed bids opened 2:00 P.M. February 3, 1967
Tabulated by: B. J. Bonds, Purchasing Agent

"CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS Bids on Electric Service Bodies

Bid No.	Description	Quantity	Utility Equipment Co.	Koenig Iron Works	Commercial Body Corp.	McCabe-Powers Body Co.
4408	Line Service Body	5 Each	\$7,980.00	\$7,525.76	<u>\$6,920.00</u>	No Bid
4409	Maintenance & Service Body	2 Each	2,842.00	<u>\$ 1,851.42</u>	2,036.50	\$2,723.60
4409	Maintenance & Service Body with Ladder Rack	1 Each	1,391.00	928.65	<u>908.25</u>	1,313.00
4410	Operations & Service Body	1 Each	1,063.75	940.41	<u>760.50</u>	1,185.80

"All prices shown are net.

"This tabulation is submitted with the apparent low bids meeting the City of Austin specifications and conditions underscored."

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 3, 1967, for the furnishing of Electric Service Bodies; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Commercial Body Corp. in the sum of \$6,920.00 for Line Service Body; in the sum of \$908.25 for Maintenance & Service Body with Ladder Rack; and in the sum of \$760.50 for Operations & Service Body; and the bid of Koenig Iron Works in the sum of \$1,851.42 for Maintenance & Service Body, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids have been recommended by the Purchasing Agent of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bids of Commercial Body Corp. in the sums of \$6,920.00, \$908.25, and \$760.50; and the bid of Koenig Iron Works in the sum of \$1,851.42 be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts on behalf of the City, with Commercial Body Corp. and Koenig Iron Works.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"February 13, 1967

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mr. Williams:

Sealed bids were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, February 10, 1967, at the Office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the INSTALLATION OF approximately 1480 feet of 12-inch and 520 feet of 8-inch cast iron WATER MAINS with an alternate proposal of 2,000 feet of 8-inch cast iron water mains IN FOREST VIEW DRIVE AND FOREST VIEW DRIVE EASEMENT. This project requires a relocation of water mains due to construction of the new Water Filter Plant Number 3. The bids were publicly opened and read in the City Council Room, Municipal Building, Austin, Texas.

"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

<u>"FIRM</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>WORKING DAYS</u>
Walter Schmidt Construction Company	\$22,624.00	40
Eland Construction Company	25,707.50	60
J. C. Evans Construction Company	26,637.00	40
City of Austin (Estimate)	\$16,330.50	20

"It is our recommendation that the contract be awarded to the Walter Schmidt Construction Company on their low bid of \$22,624.00 with 40 working days.

"Yours truly,
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.
Director Water and Sewer Department"

Councilman Long inquired about this project. The City Manager reported this Water District No. 10, 8" line runs across the new Water Treatment Plant site, and has to be relocated. A 12" line will replace part of the 8" line, and the District will pay the difference in the cost between an 8" and a 12" line, which will be about \$4,000.

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 10, 1967, for the installation of approximately 1480 feet of 12-inch and 520 feet of 8-inch cast iron water mains with an alternate proposal of 2,000 feet of 8-inch cast iron water mains in Forest View Drive and Forest View Drive Easement; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Walter Schmidt Construction Company in the sum of \$22,624.00 was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of Walter Schmidt Construction Company in the sum of \$22,624.00 be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the City with Walter Schmidt Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"Sealed bids opened 2:00 P.M. February 7, 1967
Tabulated by: B. J. Bonds, Purchasing Agent

"CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS Bids on Tractor Loaders

Bid No.	Description	Quan.	Trade- Ins.	Girard Machinery & Supply	Lanford Equipment Company	Tom Fairrey Company	Int'l. Harvester Company	Travis County Eqpt.	Roy Klossner Company	Holt Machinery Company
4411	Sanitary Sewer Tractor-Loader Backhoe Combination	3 Ea.	2 Ea.	(Case) \$18,573.94	(Massey- Ferguson) \$18,639.52	(John Deere) \$26,068.00	(Inter- national) \$18,400.00	(Ford) \$16,969.71	No Bid	No Bid
4413	Sanitary Sewer 4-Wheel Drive Tractor Shovel	1 Ea.	None	(Case) 13,015.38	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	(Trojan) \$14,673.54	(Cater- pillar) \$16,905.00
4414	Water Distribution 4-Wheel Drive Tractor Shovel	1 Ea.	1 Ea.	(Case) \$12,615.54	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	(Trojan) 13,280.00	(Cater- pillar) 15,805.00
4411	Sanitary Sewer Tractor-Loader Backhoe Combination	3 Ea.	2 Ea.	Jess McNeel Machinery No Bid	Pearce Equipment Company No Bid					
4413	Sanitary Sewer 4-Wheel Drive Tractor Shovel	1 Ea.	None	(Hough) \$12,655.00	(Michigan) \$14,450.00					
4414	Water Distribution 4-Wheel Drive Tractor Shovel	1 Ea.	1 Ea.	(Hough) \$10,155.00	(Michigan) \$12,950.00					

"All prices shown are net or net difference.

"This tabulation is submitted with the apparent low bids meeting the City of Austin specifications and conditions underscored."

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received in the City of Austin on February 7, 1967 for three (3) Tractor-Loader Backhoe Combinations and two (2) 4-Wheel Drive Tractor Shovels for use by the Sanitary Sewer Division and the Water Distribution Division of the City of Austin; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Travis County Equipment Company in the sum of \$16,969.71 for three tractor-loader backhoe combinations and two trade-ins for the Sanitary Sewer Division, and the bids of Jess McNeel Machinery in the sum of \$12,655.00 for one 4-wheel drive tractor shovel for the Sanitary Sewer Division and in the sum of \$10,155.00 for one 4-wheel drive tractor shovel and one trade-in for the Water Distribution Department, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids has been recommended by the Purchasing Agent of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bids of Travis Equipment Company and Jess McNeel Machinery in the sums recited above, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin be, and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts on behalf of the City with said companies.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"February 10, 1967

"To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., Subject: Office Building for Water & Sewage
City Manager Treatment Department & Construction
Engineering Division - Tabulation

"We are transmitting herewith a copy of letter of recommendation from James W. Crow, Architect, along with tabulation of bids for the above named project.

"The estimate for this project was \$35,000.

"We join with Mr. Ullrich and Mr. Crow in recommending the award of these contracts to the low bidders as follows:

General	C & H Construction Company, Inc.	\$63,139.00
Plumbing	C. G. Puryear	\$ 5,340.00
H. V. A. C.	Fox & Hearn	\$ 9,888.00
Electric	Lamb Electric	\$ 9,949.00
Combined Contracts	Total	\$88,316.00

"The cost per square foot for this building is \$17.66.

February 16, 1967

"Mr. Ullrich advises that funds are budgeted for this project in the Capital Improvements Program.

"From: A.M. Eldridge, Supervising Engineer
Construction Engineering Division
Signed A. M. Eldridge"

"7 February 1967

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"On 7 February 1967 bids were received for the construction of an Office Building for the City of Austin Water and Sewage Treatment Department and Construction Engineering Division to be located at 500 West First Street.

"The low bids for the several phases of the work as indicated on the attached bid tabulation were as follows:

GENERAL, C & H Construction Co.	\$63,139.00
PLUMBING Puryear Plumbing Co.	5,340.00
HVAC, Fox & Hearn	9,888.00
ELECTRICAL, Lamb Electric Co.	9,949.00
Total	<u>\$88,316.00</u>

"Since these bids were submitted in accordance with the provisions of the specifications, and since these contractors appear to be qualified to complete the work bid upon, I recommend that they be awarded the contracts for the work as indicated.

"Sincerely,
s/ James W. Crow
James W. Crow, Architect"

"BID TABULATIONS: Office Building for the City of Austin Water & Sewage Treatment Department and Construction Engineering Division

Date: 7 February 1967

JAMES W. CROW
Architect
HVAC ELEC.

BIDDER	BOND	TIME	GEN. CONTR.	PLBG. CONTR.	CONTR. CONTR.	COMB. BID
W.D. Anderson Co.	x	200	73,197.00			
A.W. Bryant Const.	x	180	69,246.00			
C & H Const.	x	210	<u>63,139.00</u>			
Eitze Const.	x	180	<u>73,747.00</u>			
Gibson Const.	x	210	76,683.00			
Gore Const.	x	180	79,177.00	5,614.00		84,500.00
Reich Const.	x	200	63,660.00			
S & G Const.	x	120	69,850.00			
Star-Field Const.	x	180	66,145.00			

"BIDDER	BOND TIME	GEN. CONTR.	PLBG.CONTR.	HVAC CONTR.	ELEC.CONTR.	COMB. BID
Cole Plbg.	x	6,600.00				
Fox-Schmidt Plbg.	x	6,060.00			12,091.00	17,651.00
Porter Plbg.	x	x		x		17,843.00
Ruryear Plbg.	x	<u>5,340.00</u>				
Air Cond. Inc.	x	x		x		19,483.00
H. L. Arnold Co.	x			11,193.00		
J.M. Boyer Co.	x	x		x		18,749.00
Fox & Hearn	x	x		<u>9,888.00</u>		16,366.00
B & B Elec.	x				11,990.00	
J & J Elec.	x				11,222.00	
Walter Johnson	x				10,534.00	
Kanetzky Elec.	x				11,137.00	
Lamb Elec.	x				<u>9,949.00</u>	
Tecapa Elec.	x				10,807.00	
Wilkins Elec.	x				12,631.00	
"SUMMARY: GEN. CONTR.		63,139.00				
PLUMBING		5,340.00				
HVAC		9,888.00				
ELEC.		<u>9,949.00</u>				
TOTAL		<u>88,316.00"</u>				

Councilman Long noted there were no combination bids. The Construction Engineer explained combination bids would have been accepted; but when the contractors made a combination bid, they created no low bid situation, and no combination was offered. In answer to Mayor Palmer's question about the size of the building, the City Manager stated the first plan for new construction called for this same floor area. When it was set up as an extension to the existing building, an estimate of \$50,000 was made. When it was decided to have a separate building they set up \$90,000. Councilman LaRue noted the cost per square foot was reduced from some \$20.00 to \$17.66. Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 7, 1967, for the construction of an Office Building for the City of Austin Water and Sewage Treatment Department and Construction Engineering Division to be located at 500 West First Street; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of C & H Construction Company, Inc. in the sum of \$63,139.00 for general construction work; the bid of C. G. Ruryear in the sum of \$5,340.00 for the plumbing work; the bid of Fox & Hearn in the sum of \$9,888.00 for H.V.A.C. work; and the bid of Lamb Electric in the sum of \$9,949.00 for the electric work, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids have been recommended by the Supervising Engineer of the Construction Engineering Division of the City of Austin and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bid of C & H Construction Company, Inc. in the sum of \$63,139.00; the bid of C. G. Ruryear in the sum of \$5,340.00; the bid of Fox & Hearn in the sum of \$9,888.00; and the bid of Lamb Electric in the sum of \$9,949.00, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts on behalf of the

City with C & H Construction Company, Inc.; C. G. Puryear; Fox & Hearn; and with Lamb Electric.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:
 Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
 Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"February 16, 1967

"To the City Council
 City of Austin, Texas

Re: Completion and Acceptance of Work Improving
 Portions of Certain Streets in the City of
 Austin Being Unit Number 66-3

"The work of improving portions of the following named street in the City of Austin, being Unit Number 66-3, dated September 28, 1966, between the City of Austin and J. C. Evans Construction Company, Inc., has been performed and completed by J. C. Evans Construction Company, Inc. in full compliance with the contract and the plans and specifications therein contained:

<u>"Street</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Tinnin Ford Road	NPL East Riverside Drive	SPL South Lakeshore Boulevard

"I have inspected, approved, and accepted the work and improvements referred to, and I now recommend that the same be accepted and received by the City Council as having been performed and completed in compliance with the contract, plans, and specifications referred to above.

"Respectfully submitted,
 s/ S. Reuben Rountree, Jr.
 S. Reuben Rountree, Jr.
 Director of Public Works"

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE RECEIVING AND ACCEPTING THE WORK OF IMPROVING TINNIN FORD ROAD, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREBELOW DEFINED, PERFORMED BY J. C. EVANS, AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATES IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The City Manager submitted the following:

"February 13, 1967

"To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr. Subject: SALE OF HOUSES
City Manager

"Bids were opened in my office February 13, 1967 at 10:00 A.M. for the sale of five (5) houses that Urban Renewal has turned over to us for disposal, four (4) to be demolished and one (1) to be moved.

"Bids from nine different individuals were received and a breakdown of the bidding is as follows:

BIDDERS	1801 Washington	1405 East 12th	1707 East 12th	1502 New York	1701 "B" New York
Weldon Johnston	\$250.00	\$33.00	\$37.50	\$27.50	\$ 3.00
I. Anderson	----	----	----	----	10.00
A.M. DeBerry	756.80	----	----	----	----
J.H. Means	650.00	----	30.00	----	----
D & R Farms	180.10	<u>42.00</u>	<u>51.00</u>	<u>45.00</u>	----
E.A. Bradford	1187.57	----	----	----	----
A. Heyer	----	15.00	37.50	38.50	12.50
M.J. Kouri	1157.87	----	----	----	----
J. Norman	150.00	----	----	----	----

"The high bid on each house is underscored in red. Due to the fact that four (4) of these structures are dilapidated and one (1) classified as habitable, it is recommended that these bids be accepted, as it would cost this office several hundred dollars if we had to demolish them.

"If the bids are acceptable, the contracts will be forwarded to you for your signature, and should be returned to me for attestation and distribution.

"From: Dick T. Jordan, Building Official
Signed Dick T. Jordan"

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 13, 1967 for the sale of five (5) houses that Urban Renewal turned over to the City for disposal, four (4) to be demolished and one (1) to be moved; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of D & R Farms in the sum of \$42.00 for the house located at 1405 East 12th, in the sum of \$51.00 for the house located at 1707 East 12th and in the sum of \$45.00 for the house located at 1502 New York; the bid of E. A. Bradford in the sum of \$1187.57 for the house located at 1801 Washington; and the bid of A. Heyer in the sum of \$12.50 for the house located at 1701 "B" New York, were the highest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids has been recommended by the Building Official of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager, Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the bids of D & R Farms, E. A. Bradford and A. Heyer, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts on behalf of the City with said parties.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Council had before it the sale of lots in Kealing Project. Councilman Long inquired who were the buyers and if the lots were to be developed into single family dwellings or apartments. The City Attorney reported the Urban Renewal plan shows these to be single family dwellings--not apartments. Councilman Long inquired if these people were buying to build homes or if someone were buying to build duplexes to rent. The City Attorney reported the dwellings are to be single family houses for homes or for rental property.

Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on February 7, 1967, the Board of Commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin adopted Resolution Number 30-67, by which the Board accepted the bid of George E. Friday and wife Lois J. Friday for the purchase of parcel R-14(3), a tract of land situated in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project, No. Tex. R-20, and more particularly described in said Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, said Resolution Number 30-67, as an official action of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin, is a public record on file in the office of said Agency at 614 West 6th Street, and said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, an executed copy of said Resolution was forwarded to the City Council on the 8th day of February, 1967, by the Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency for approval of the price and conditions of the proposed sale of said property; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds nothing objectionable concerning the price

and conditions of said bid as submitted, and the recommendation of said Urban Renewal Agency Board as contained in said Resolution Number 30-67; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN

That the price and conditions set forth in the Bid of George E. Friday and wife Lois J. Friday for the purchase of parcel No. R-14(3) in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project No. Tex. R-20 are hereby approved.

(Lot 3-A, Resubdivision of Lot 1, Block A, Kealing Subdivision - 180' x 147' x 120' - \$2,600)

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White

Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on February 7, 1967, the Board of Commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin adopted Resolution Number 20-67, by which the Board accepted the bid of Charles Floyd Taylor and wife Margaret Ann Taylor for the purchase of parcel R-14(4), a tract of land situated in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project, No. Tex. R-20 and more particularly described in said Resolution and,

WHEREAS, said Resolution Number 20-67, as an official action of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin is a public record on file in the office of said Agency at 614 West 6th Street, and said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, an executed copy of said Resolution was forwarded to the City Council on the 8th day of February, 1967, by the Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency for approval of the price and conditions of the proposed sale of said property; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds nothing objectionable concerning the price and conditions of said bid as submitted, and the recommendation of said Urban Renewal Agency Board as contained in said Resolution Number 20-67; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN

That the price and conditions set forth in the Bid of Floyd Taylor and wife Margaret Ann Taylor for the purchase of parcel No. R-14(4) in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project No. Tex. R-20 are hereby approved.

(Lot 4-A, Resubdivision of Lot 1, Block A, Kealing Subdivision - 60' x 130' - \$2,200.00)

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White

Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on February 7, 1967, the Board of Commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin adopted Resolution Number 19-67, by which the Board accepted the bid of Louis Major Barrow and wife Bessie M. Barrow for the purchase of parcel R-14(1), a tract of land situated in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project, No. Tex. R-20, and more particularly described in said Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, said Resolution Number 19-67, as an official action of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin, is a public record on file in the office of said Agency at 614 West 6th Street, and said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, an executed copy of said Resolution was forwarded to the City Council on the 8th day of February, 1967, by the Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency for approval of the price and conditions of the proposed sale of said property; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds nothing objectionable concerning the price and conditions of said bid as submitted, and the recommendation of said Urban Renewal Agency Board as contained in said Resolution Number 19-67; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN

That the price and conditions set forth in the Bid of Louis Major Barrow and wife Bessie M. Barrow for the purchase of parcel No. R-14(1) in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project No. Tex. R-20 are hereby approved.

(Lot 1-A, Resubdivision of Lot 1, Block A, Kealing Subdivision -
60' x 130' - \$2,400)

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White

Councilman Shanks offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on February 7, 1967, the Board of Commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin adopted Resolution Number 21-67, by which the Board accepted the bid of Darrell Cummings for the purchase of parcel R-14(2), a tract of land situated in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project, No. Tex. R-20, and more particularly described in said Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, said Resolution Number 21-67, as an official action of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin, is a public record on file in the office of said Agency at 614 West 6th Street, and said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, an executed copy of said Resolution was forwarded to the City Council on the 8th day of February, 1967, by the Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency for approval of the price and conditions of the proposed sale of said property; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds nothing objectionable concerning the price and conditions of said bid as submitted, and the recommendation of said Urban Renewal Agency Board as contained in said Resolution Number 21-67; NOW THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN

That the price and conditions set forth in the Bid of Darrell Cummings for the purchase of parcel No. R-14(2) in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project No. Tex. R-20 are hereby approved.

(Lot 2-A, Resubdivision of Lot 1, Block A, Kealing Subdivision - 60' x 130' - \$2,200.00)

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White

The City Attorney called attention to another sale needing Council approval. Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, on February 7, 1967, the Board of Commissioners of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin adopted Resolution Number 22-67, by which the Board accepted the bid of Darrell Cummings for the purchase of parcel R-12, a tract of land situated in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project, No. Tex. R-20, and more particularly described in said Resolution; and,

WHEREAS, said Resolution Number 22-67, as an official action of the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Austin, is a public record on file in the office of said Agency at 614 West 6th Street, and said Resolution is incorporated herein by reference for all purposes; and,

WHEREAS, an executed copy of said Resolution was forwarded to the City Council on the 8th day of February, 1967, by the Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency for approval of the price and conditions of the proposed sale of said property; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council finds nothing objectionable concerning the price and conditions of said bid as submitted, and the recommendation of said Urban Renewal Agency Board as contained in said Resolution Number 22-67; NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN

That the price and conditions set forth in the Bid of Darrell Cummings for the purchase of parcel No. R-12 in the Kealing Urban Renewal Project No. Tex. R-20

are hereby approved.

(Lot 3-B, Resubdivision of a Portion of Lot 3, Block 5, George L. Robertson's Subdivision, Out of Outlot No. 56, Division B - 50' x 131' - \$1,750.00)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White

BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION ON SUBSTANDARD HOUSE

The Council had the recommendation from the Building Standards Commission on a substandard house at 1401 Deloney - Mr. Peter R. Zaremba. The Building Official reported the structure was condemned in August, 1965; and at that time, it was unoccupied. Since then Mr. Zaremba sold the house on a sales contract to ANTONIO MINDIETA telling him it was all right for him to move in as long as he was not renting the property. The "Condemned" sign was torn from the door. The Building Official described the condition of the house as having no plumbing; windows and screens were off, and the doors were down. Mr. Zaremba did appear at the Commission meeting. The structure was condemned when Mr. Zaremba told the man to move in. Four days after the Board heard the appeal, Mr. Zaremba issued a deed to Mr. Mindieta and had it recorded. The Building Official said the structure was definitely substandard, and there are no sanitary facilities at all. Councilman Long stated these occupants should go under the relocation program, as this was a substandard house. Councilman Long moved to accept the recommendation of the Building Standards Commission and to request the City Manager to have this family go through the process of relocation. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Later in the meeting MR. PETER ZAREMBA appeared stating on January 31, 1964, he sold this property to MR. ANTONIO MINDIETA on a contract of sale, and at the time it was still vacant. He reported a misdelivery of a letter dated about August 27, 1965, as it was sent to his address on Sharon Lane, but finally delivered to him on Balcones. He read the letter he wrote to MR. RADER in the Building Official's Office, stating he had sold the property on contract of sale to Mr. Mindieta, 1401 Deloney, on January 1, 1965. He reported another letter was sent to his Sharon Lane address, and it was forwarded to him advising of a hearing on February 8th, 1967. He reported on his late appearance before the Board and his request that it give Mr. Mindieta more opportunity, since he was not a legal owner of the property, to see if he could make the necessary changes, but the Board had already made its decision. On January 27th, 1967, the property was transferred, and the deed was executed with a lien against it and Mr. Mindieta would like to have more time. The Building Official stated the Board postponed Mr. Zaremba's case to the end of the meeting at his request; and the Board did hear Mr. Zaremba at 8:15. It was pointed out Mr. Zaremba was the legal title holder according to the records until the last few days. Councilman LaRue said the property was sold on January 1, 1965, but no one moved in until August 1965; and at the time they moved in, there was a

"condemned" sign. Health hazards were discussed. Councilman LaRue stated the Council had made arrangements for some Department to relocate these people in better housing than this. Mr. Zarembo said he would tell the owners they would have to bring the house up to standards or leave. It was pointed out MR. MINDIETA was notified of the hearing to be held today.

Councilman Shanks moved that the Council reconsider its action taken on this matter earlier. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman LaRue made a statement that an attempt should be made to move these people out now. This man is the owner of record now; and if he were moved into better quarters he could be given this 60 or 90 days for making the repairs.

Councilman Long moved that the Council give 90 days for the owner of this property, MR. MINDEITA, to bring it up to the minimum standards within the 90 days. The motion, seconded by Councilman Shanks, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

UNIVERSITY - STREET AND ALLEY VACATION

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING FOR PUBLIC USE PORTIONS OF WOOLDRIDGE STREET, EAST 26-1/2 STREET, EAST 29TH STREET, EAST 26-1/2 STREET ALLEY, WOOLDRIDGE STREET ALLEY AND SPEEDWAY ALLEY, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING EASEMENTS FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES AND DRAINAGE PURPOSES; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the

ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING FOR PUBLIC USE PORTIONS OF EAST 23RD STREET, EAST 23-1/2 STREET, SABINE STREET, OLDHAM STREET, RED RIVER STREET ALLEY, SABINE STREET ALLEY, AND OLDHAM STREET ALLEY, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING EASEMENTS FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES AND DRAINAGE PURPOSES; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman LaRue moved that MR. AND MRS. W. D. ADAMS be heard. The motion was seconded by Councilman White. Roll call showed a unanimous vote.

Mrs. Adams asked help in getting the bus stop removed from the corner of her property on Bouldin and James as her picket fence was destroyed, and the chain link fence replacing it is being damaged by those waiting for the bus. She reported debris also accumulates. Councilman Long moved to instruct MR. BEN WHITE, Member of the Council, to work with the Bus Company and try to get this problem worked out. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by

the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

Present but not voting: Councilman White

MRS. ADAMS reported a large dead tree on city property at 1201 Bouldin. The Director of Public Works stated this tree would be removed in the next few days.

MRS. ADAMS asked that the dog ordinance be enforced, and made a complaint about an owner across the street who turns his dog loose every morning. This dog barks all the time. Councilman LaRue stated the address would be turned over to the Police Department.

MRS. ADAMS complained about the condition of the alley which needs cleaning from Bouldin to South 3rd. The Mayor stated the alley in most cases was the property owners' responsibility to keep clean. Occasionally the City grades the alley and clears the weeds. Councilman Long suggested that those people be notified that they are supposed to put the trash in the cans and have lids on the containers.

At 10:30 A.M., MAYOR PALMER opened the public hearing on improving the following streets:

<u>STREET</u>	<u>FROM</u>	<u>TO</u>
Denver Avenue	EPL Tillery Street	WPL Pershing Drive
Greenwood Avenue	NPL East 19th Street	SPL Manor Road
Palo Pinto Drive (West Drive)	NGL East 19th Street	SPL Denver Avenue
Palo Pinto Drive (East Drive)	NGL East 19th Street	Pershing Drive
Palo Pinto Drive	NGL Denver Avenue	SPL Manor Road
East St. John's Avenue	EPL North Interregional Highway	A point 156' east of EPL Blessing Avenue

The City Attorney announced this was properly advertised and notices sent to the individual property owners. MR. BEN WILLIAMS, owner of the property on the corner of Blessing and St. Johns Avenue, had no objections to the paving, but inquired about the financing. He was referred to the Department of Public Works to arrange for time payments of the \$582.77 assessment. The Director of Public Works stated St. Johns Avenue was a through street from the Interregional Highway to Reagan High School. The City Attorney noted this property was given credit for 50' of paving on the side street. The Mayor pointed out he had a very valuable piece of property. Councilman Long explained if Mr. Williams could not pay for the paving now, there would be a lien which would have to be paid by the heirs of his property. MR. LLOYD KERBEY, owner of property on East St. John and Bethune stated he had no objection to the paving. He had acquired this property as an investment, and inquired if this corner would be zoned commercial, as the market value plus the paving costs would make it too costly for residential property. Mr. Kerbey was advised he could apply for a zoning change any time. He also was given a side lot credit of 50'. MR. IRA ROGERS, representative of NEW BETHANY BAPTIST CHURCH, 3304 Manor Road and

Greenwood, asked that the payments be worked out on a time basis. He was referred to the Public Works Department to make these arrangements.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING THE HEARING GIVEN TO THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS OF PROPERTY ABUTTING UPON SUNDRY STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREINAFTER DEFINED, AS TO SPECIAL BENEFITS TO ACCRUE TO SAID PROPERTY AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF BY VIRTUE OF THE IMPROVEMENT OF SAID STREETS WITHIN SAID LIMITS, AND AS TO ANY ERRORS, INVALIDITIES OR IRREGULARITIES IN ANY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OR CONTRACT THEREFOR; FINDING AND DETERMINING THAT EACH AND EVERY PARCEL OF PROPERTY ABUTTING UPON SAID STREETS WITHIN THE LIMITS DEFINED WILL BE SPECIALLY BENEFITED AND ENHANCED IN VALUE IN EXCESS OF THE AMOUNT OF THE COST OF SAID IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED TO BE, AND AS, ASSESSED AGAINST SAID ABUTTING PROPERTY AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, AND LEVYING AN ASSESSMENT FOR THE PAYMENT OF A PORTION OF THE COST OF IMPROVING SAID STREETS WITHIN THE LIMITS DEFINED, FIXING A CHARGE AND LIEN AGAINST ALL SAID ABUTTING PROPERTIES, AND THE REAL AND TRUE OWNERS THEREOF, PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF ASSIGNABLE CERTIFICATES UPON THE COMPLETION AND ACCEPTANCE OF SAID WORK, THE MANNER AND TIME OF PAYMENT THEREOF, AND PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER AND METHOD OF COLLECTION OF SAID ASSESSMENTS AND CERTIFICATES; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON ITS PASSAGE.
(Denver Avenue and other streets)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Mayor and Council greeted and welcomed six social study students from Porter Junior High School.

At 10:45 A.M., the Mayor opened the hearing on annexing 3.42 acres out of the Santiago Del Valle Grant. No one appeared to be heard. Councilman LaRue moved that the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 3.42 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE SANTIAGO DEL VALLE GRANT IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(Unplatted land)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

HEARING ON MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

1.3 acre tract at the end
of Daffodil Drive, south
of Ben White Boulevard in
the Montopolis Area

The Planning Director reviewed the request as was considered in March, 1966. The request originates from a 1.3 acre tract at the end of Daffodil Drive. He described the area involved showing Ben White Boulevard going through the Montopolis area to the interchange with the Lockhart-Bastrop Highway and a railroad spur about 1500' south. Beginning in the vicinity of Congress Avenue, extending east for several miles, along the railroad spur, there is a designated industrial area in the plan including this section on both sides of Montopolis Drive. Specifically, the individual request is to change the Master Plan on 1.3 acres to residential. Within the area there are 29 single family homes along Daffodil Drive, and Montopolis Drive. The rest of the area is undeveloped or agricultural land. The Planning Commission originally recommended an area to be redesignated as low density residential with the idea if there were a specific industrial use, it could go in through the Planned Development Area route, considering the 29 existing houses in the area. The Planning Commission reheard

this matter recently, and recommended changing the area from manufacturing and related use designation to low density residential of 300 acres east of Montopolis Drive, permitting Mr. Bowles, and others to develop a residential use including apartments or single family dwellings without creating any particular problem. The Planning Director suggested a change of boundary line; but the owners of the property involved in the suggestion oppose changing their property from the industrial designation to the residential. He suggested a boundary line as a compromise, considering the number of residential uses already present, offering a possibility if some industrial use were made along with the 1.3 acre tract that it could come under the Planned Development Area provision. This land is owned by Mr. Sid Thomas. Councilman Shanks favored taking only the 1.3 acre tract and redesignating it, since the property owners to the east objected to changing their property. The Planning Director pointed out the problems in permitting piece-meal industrial development. In this case there are about 34 individual owners. MAYOR PALMER pointed out one industry purchased 400 acres while industry is slow to develop and ties up land, this little 1.3 acres could influence the entire 300 acres for an industrial site. With all the trackage available and the main thoroughfare, he said it would not be good to change the one little section, particularly in light of all the activity going on. MR. RAISCH was interested in the residential designation, stating two of the lots are already in a subdivision and the owners want to build apartments. The lots were sold in 1956 and 58, prior to the development of the Master Plan and residential development has taken place on Daffodil Drive and along Montopolis and Burleson Road. The Mayor pointed out the area north of Ben White Boulevard was residential, unimproved and available for all types of residential uses; and there is no shortage of any residential area. The Planning Director recalled the belief of many that in 1961, the industrial designation of 4000 acres was excessive; but the reverse seems to be the trend now. MR. RAISCH stated they purchased the land as a planned subdivision from MR. THOMAS in 1957. MR. HUB BECHTOL showed the land Mr. Thomas owned. He had come in with two sections of approved subdivisions on Daffodil and Mr. Thomas had nothing to do with his property being designated as industrial in the Master Plan and they were not objecting to MR. RAISCH'S using the property as originally intended. Mr. Thomas' property is in an industrial classification; and if it were to revert to residential, he would have a difficult time marketing the remaining 83 acres. In answer to Councilman Shanks' question, Mr. Bechtol stated there were residences scattered all over the property that Mr. Thomas had sold on the periphery, but not in the middle. Mr. Thomas has 83 acres to sell; and should someone want to use it for residential, he would have no objection. He did object to rolling the whole area back to residential. He pointed out a prime industrial site. Their position was that Mr. Thomas did not ask for his property to be designated industrial; and they have no objections to those who purchased property from him using it as residential.

MR. HENRY WIRE and MR. FRIEDRICK wanted to keep the area industrially designated. Mr. Wire pointed out the 175 acres east of Montopolis Drive which Mr. Friedrich owned, and the area they had sold south of the spur. North of the spur there is a gravel pit which would not be suitable for a subdivision. All of this area is raw land. Mr. Friedrich had owned this property plus some north of Ben White Boulevard since 1943. He planned to sell the property south of the railroad for commercial or for factories. MR. RAISCH said their two lots were already in a subdivision, and now it was not permissible to build in a subdivision since the area was designated industrial. It was pointed out utilities would not be available. The Mayor asked Mr. Raisch if he would be willing to wait a short period of time to see if some industrial development might take place. Mr. Raisch did not believe this small area would make any difference.

MAYOR PALMER introduced into the record a letter from the Austin Chamber of Commerce, signed by MR. IRA LON MORGAN, President, citing the Economic Development Council of the Austin Chamber of Commerce suggests that the City Council give close scrutiny to any proposal reducing the amount of industrial acreage available. Recent searches for land for incoming industries revealed a shortage of large tracts, possessing the combination of highway access, useful terrain, utilities and railroad trackage.

Councilman Long inquired if Mr. Bowles and Mr. Raisch kept their property and industrial came in, if they could work out a plan with the industrial area where they could have an apartment complex there, through the planned development section. The Director of Planning stated that was right. Mr. Bechtol stated if some of the area could be planned residential under the Planned Development Area they would have no objection. Councilman Long stated the industry would have its plan and then the residential area would be incorporated in the plan. The City Attorney stated this would require the agreement of all the property owners in a covenant running with the land concerning the specific use. The Council wanted to go look at this whole area.

The Council recessed until 2:30 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:30 P.M.

At 2:30 P.M. the Council resumed its business.

HEARING ON AUSTIN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

MAYOR PALMER announced this was a special hearing on the proposed expressway and arterial street plans based on the Austin Transportation Plan. He explained a few years ago it was determined that a City of 50,000 or more must develop a transportation plan or it would no longer participate in any Highway or any Bureau of Public Road Funds. Austin together with the Highway Department and the County, working with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, developed a transportation plan for Austin. This hearing is to give the public a chance to express their views.

The City Manager stated those who were appointed to make the study adopted it as such. As a study it had a number of recommendations, including the Missouri Pacific Boulevard, which the Highway Department decided to proceed to develop, because of this plan.

The standards, arterial and expressway routes are the matters for the Council to consider and either adopt or reject. The standards would include widths of rights of way, widths of construction and design of streets in typical sections. General alignments are set up for the arterial system and expressway system, which are anticipated to be needed in Austin by 1982. Councilman Long inquired about the elevated streets and if that were to be considered today. The City Manager saw no need to determine today or in the near future as to how the street is to be designed. Councilman Shanks noted the plan always would be subject to change. MAYOR PALMER introduced representatives from Travis County, and the State Highway Department.

The Director of Planning presented the plan, stating the Transportation

Study began in 1962-1963 as the Origin and Destination Study, a joint City-Highway Department project. The Austin Urban Transportation Study Office was set up through the Highway Department. A study extending through 1965 developed the Transportation Plan which covered not only thoroughfares, expressways, major streets, but also matters of transit, transportation, signalization, parking, types of sign control, etc., and these are contained in summary form in the document called the Austin Transportation Plan.

The particular item under consideration today is that of the expressway plan and major arterial plan, present or planned for the future. These two items as proposed would completely replace the present thoroughfare plan which is a part of the Master Plan as adopted in 1961.

The Planning Director outlined the items included into this study--a forecast of population in 1982; future land uses of the city in a 200 square mile area; future intensity of use of land which would produce traffic; forecast of the number and usage of automobiles, other forms of transportation; and origin and destination of the traffic. He pointed out three major points of destination in 1962--the University of Texas area, the Capitol and the Downtown area. Time and distance of travel were included and statistics were reviewed in each item. The result of these studies and forecasts pointed out the existing thoroughfare plan would not meet the future transportation needs of Austin.

The Planning Director explained how various plans had developed and described the Central Expressway idea, and how it would work and how it would affect the other expressways. He pointed out on a map the expressway plan and the changes between the existing thoroughfare plan and this proposed plan. The changes included the following:

1. Addition of the Central Expressway through the central area of the City in the vicinity of Lamar and Guadalupe, through the University area down to the central area of the City.
2. A cross-town expressway from Springdale Road, paralleling 12th Street, entering 15th Street, through the Capitol Area crossing Lamar Boulevard, tying back into the Missouri Pacific Boulevard on the west side.
3. Camp Mabry Expressway, a short route along the general alignment of 34th or 35th Street from the Missouri Pacific Boulevard to the Central Expressway.
4. The Riverside Drive Expressway, modifying the present plan, to cross the lake at the extension of Trinity and San Jacinto and continuing on Riverside Drive to the south east.
5. Continuation of the Outer Loop, around Decker Lake, as a major arterial street.
6. Additions were made in the area of East 19th Street, FM 969 paralleling the two railroads up to U.S. 290.

The Planning Director pointed out two areas of modification.

1. Northeast, north of Highway 290 over to Interstate 35, which had a thoroughfare system not following the lane use, terrain, drainage ways, etc. These were mainly relocations of proposed streets.
2. Below Ben White Boulevard, east of I.H. 35 property alignments are different from those in other parts of the community; and although there have been some revisions in the section, he could not identify any situation where there had been a change in substance.

The Planning Director displayed the combination map explaining the standards for development for expressways, and those for arterial streets, and the types, and applied them to the listed expressways and arterial streets, on pages 187, 186, 181 and 229 of the Austin Transportation Plan 1962-1982. Detailed discussion was held. On the Central Expressway the Advisory Committee recommended the expressway portion be elevated from 15th to 29th Street with surfaced frontage roads. In the technical discussion of the expressways, the Planning Director stated the minimum width was 200' up to 360'.

The Central Expressway location was general, where it was possible to use the existing road, with San Antonio and Nueces Streets as frontage roads, the expressway section being elevated. Underneath there would be parking space. In answer to Councilman Long's inquiry about advantages of elevating the expressway, the Planning Director pointed out the numerous cross streets in the vicinity. As to the area underneath, the Highway Department, Federal Government, County and the City would have to agree on its use.

The Planning Director next discussed design and matters of location. The exact alignments have not been identified in this plan. Drawings were made for analytical purposes, but not as a part of the plan which shows general locations in which minor realignment in a roadway could be made without amending the Master Plan. In regard to the Central Expressway, he said there was a four or five block latitude within which it could be placed. Beyond that it would be a major realignment, and the issue should be referred back to the Planning Commission and City Council to see if a major realignment existed. The City Manager described the route of the Central Expressway from Highway 290 and Interstate 35 southwest-erly to what is now an extension of Guadalupe Street. The roadway going out Lamar is a spur off of the Central Expressway. He explained the locations were set up and traffic forecast made through computer processes as how much and what traffic would use the various locations. If the relocations materially changed that use or reduced the use of the roadway, it would be a matter for the Council.

The Planning Director then discussed the major arterial streets, and pointed out beginning on Page 229 of the plan, a listing of the streets and the types, the width of right of way, paving, etc. MAYOR PALMER said the cost involved must be recognized, and the price tag placed on this plan is \$132,000,000. He pointed out the complications involved where a route is drawn through certain property and the owner wants to develop, and the City is not at that time prepared to acquire the right of way. Austin does have time to develop a transportation plan and a system and not make the mistake many other cities have made where it is either impossible or too costly to correct. Even with the terrific price tag on this, he doubted if it would ever be any less. The accomplishment is something to be given a lot of study. He opened the discussion to the public to hear how this would affect their property and what they thought of the matter.

MR. ROGER HANKS asked if there were a chronological period set up for the Expressway system. It was pointed out there would have to be some general priorities, and the Mayor stated the number ONE priority was the Missouri Pacific Boulevard. It was already set up, and this is the reason the State agreed to participate. The Planning Director said there were priorities on expressways with respect to arterial streets; but it was determined because of the shifts, that priorities should not be adopted as a part of the plan, but be determined under the procedures of the Highway Department programming, the City's Capital Improvement Plan, the Council's adoption of an annual budget, and the bond funds. MR. LONDON BRADFELD inquired of the amount of the City's expenditure out of the

\$132,000,000. The City Manager stated it would be a small amount of the \$132,000,000 from now until 1982--perhaps around \$20-\$25,000,000.

MR. SAM DUNHAM suggested that the section of the Central Expressway from 29th to 19th, and the section from 19th to 11th be bracketed for further study. The University area, probably the most important segment of the City's core area, should be dealt with very gently and with great care and sensitivity. In building a transportation system, a lot more is being done than creating ways for cars to travel. He believed taking 20 or 30 blocks out of the University area just for parking would violate this area for unity, for pedestrians and for shops related to that area. His proposal to the Council was, although this plan is some 12-15 years off, that the routes as shown not be adopted or approved but bracketed or shelved and restudied. MAYOR PALMER pointed out in all of the studies, the City realized the importance of the State Capitol complex and the University. He reviewed immediate plans that from 11th to 15th Streets there would be no cross town streets; 15th Street will be the only cross town thoroughfare up to 19th Street. The State will be moving up to 19th Street, and the University will be moving from 26th back to 19th Street with no through streets from 19th to 26th. That is why the 15th Street thoroughfare was retained, and worked along with State plans. He wanted to assure the people that the City was working very closely with the University and the State; and that it is recognized they are the two largest industries, and that those are the two destinations to which most of the people want to go.

MR. W. O. SCHULTZ living west of the University between 19th and 29th stated it was very important to the people who live in the area to let them know where the route will be so the people can make their plans now.

MR. LEO LEWIS contended Lamar was already existing, and it would be less expensive to build over it than tearing down buildings. He suggested building over Guadalupe, Congress and others; and using the area over the streets for traffic--double deck streets.

MAYOR PALMER read a resolution from the Austin Chapter A.I.A., asking that one landscape architect and one architect be appointed as members of the Austin Urban Transportation Study Advisory Committee; and that the City should adopt the use of a multi-professional team at the basic level of expressway and major street evaluation and design and listing who should be on this design team.

MR. THOMAS SHEFELMAN, Architect, pointed out concern of handling the expressway in a sensitive manner as to what it would do to certain properties. Questions would be answered more easily if the team were enlarged. Councilman Long asked if there were room for expansion of this Committee so that landscape architects and designers could serve on it. It was stated the contract which set up the Committee could be amended. The Planning Director had discussed this with MR. TOM K. WOOD, District Engineer of the Highway Department, and he had indicated either expansion of the committee or substitution of certain individuals. The City Manager stated a proposal could be made to the Highway Department for amending the contract. It would need to be decided who would designate the architect--the State, City, County, or the Association of Architects. Councilman Long stated the City was more concerned with the design as to how it would fit into the City as a whole. MAYOR PALMER said the State Highway Department had been concerned about the esthetics and beauty of highways and expressways long before the National program began. Many years ago they planted all kinds of trees along the highways; and the engineers are concerned about the attractiveness of the highways and try to make them as beautiful as possible. He stated

the Highway Department and Commission deserved a lot of credit on their concern about the landscaping and attractiveness of these highways. Councilman Long suggested that rather on a state-wide basis that there be an architect for the Austin design on the committee. Mr. Shefelman said Texas had the most wonderful highways in the world. His suggestion was to help on problems inside the City. The City Manager called attention to the larger plan in which there was a whole Chapter on Community Values, devoted to esthetics, and to all effects that expressways might have. Covered in the study are some of the things that traffic might destroy. One of the reasons for the continuing study, is to keep those things in mind and try to develop a system that will accommodate the traffic conditions without destroying the other values. The Planning Director pointed out the trend throughout the country to employ a consulting architect, and a number of cities are joining with the Highway Department as the highway systems get into the centers of the City.

The Planning Director outlined his three recommendations: (1) That the City and Highway Department should carefully evaluate the impact on the area in their continuing studies, and the possibility of alternate locations and improvement of designs and appearance; (2) the continued study should include the evaluation of transit and other possible means of moving people; and (3) the actual employment of these design specialists from the planning stage up to the final engineering stage.

COUNCILMAN SHANKS emphasized the fact that the Highway Department was No. 1; and Austin is in the most fortunate position of any City in the State, and he had a lot of confidence in the Highway Department.

MR. JOHN HORTON stated if the Central Expressway were brought down in its present location, it would take out a lot of fraternity and sorority houses, would be very expensive, and it would be a mistake when there is a natural route along Lamar. He protested the location of the Central Expressway, stating it should be very carefully studied.

MRS. MARY LIB THORNHILL thought one of the things most beautiful about Austin was the street lay-out and the City should provide the beauty for the newcomers as had been provided for the City. About 1212 students would be displaced by the Central Expressway as proposed, and their moving out would bring more cars into the area. She was opposed to the expressway coming down Lamar as there are children who play along Shoal Creek; and with the great influx of population coming in, the children will have no place to go for recreation. It was pointed out there was nothing in this plan to disturb the hike and bike trail.

MR. S. C. BARTLETT, Heritage Society, endorsed what had been said concerning the Central Expressway. An elevated eight lane highway near the University could be hideous, and he emphasized the need for further planning.

MR. W. L. BRADFIELD stated his family owned property along the proposed right of way, and they were interested in the very best transportation system possible with the least possible effect on the values already established. He endorsed the further study of the Central Expressway. He did not believe the present location of the expressway would accomplish the best use.

COUNCILMAN SHANKS inquired of the results of the thinking of building the expressway instead of using Lamar. The Planning Director pointed out the disadvantages, (1) being a serious impact on the Shoal Creek Parkway; (2) difficulty

in gaining access from the expressway along Lamar over to the University area; (3) this alignment would run through a number of very new buildings, and a major problem of the Caswell Tennis Courts. In answer to Councilman Shanks' question, the Planning Director stated it would be cheaper to come down Lamar. The City Manager stated there would be 25-30,000 cars to be taken from this expressway back to the University. The idea was to come off the expressway into the parking area without having to move into a maze of streets. Mayor Palmer asked if the main concern of the greatest number of people was the Central Expressway. No one expressed any interest in any other thoroughfare other than the Central Expressway.

MR. RALPH BICKLER inquired about the 15th Street Expressway from the Interregional west. The Mayor explained this expressway would go to the Missouri Pacific Boulevard, and the route was pointed out to Mr. Bickler.

MRS. MAY MATTHEWS asked about the widening of 6th Street when the Missouri Pacific Boulevard came through. It was explained 5th and 6th Streets would be a pair of one-way streets.

COUNCILMAN LARUE asked which was the primary objective--to carry people from the north to the south or to take them to the University? The Planning Director replied that north of 24th Street, the potential traffic would be 80,000 cars peeling off 25-35,000 into the University area, and 50,000 cars feeding into the Capitol area, and central business area.

The City Attorney asked if the study contained any estimate of the number of off street parking spaces that could be provided under the expressway; and if the distance from the expressway to the University generally was acceptable walking distance. The Planning Director stated it was within walking distance; also the University is attempting some sort of inter-campus transportation. The University is becoming a commuting university, and it perhaps is not going to be possible to have a residential University. Councilman Long asked if consideration had been given to tunneling underground. The Planning Director stated the Staff Engineers were aware of the tunneling costs and this was not considered.

MR. ROGER HANKS, President of the Austin Board of Realtors, said they were not taking a definite stand.

MAYOR PALMER said this meeting had pointed up several facts--perhaps enlarging on the committee including those who had offered their services, and having further studies. MR. DUNHAM said he would put his ideas in writing and send them to the Council. He said the Central Expressway would bisect the City, would be a noise generator and create air pollution. His concern was preserving the unity of the area by running the expressway elsewhere and making this area habitable. MRS. DUNBAR stated this area, if an expressway is put through would cease to be an area where people had concern for one another. She discussed Caswell Tennis Courts, stating they were not getting enough revenue from the members now.

MR. TOM BRADFIELD stated the University neighborhood was on the verge of curing many of its own problems. MRS. SEARIGHT was opposed to having an expressway in the center of the University.

COUNCILMAN LONG asked about the Camp Mabry Thoroughfare. The Director of Planning showed this as an example of the funneling project of bringing cars from the perimeter into the center sections.

MAYOR PALMER thanked Mr. Schultz, Highway Engineer and Mr. Johnson from the Highway Department, people from the County and all of the citizens for attending this hearing. Mayor Palmer announced there were no comments on any of the other expressways or arterial streets.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

MAYOR PALMER brought up for consideration the possibility of amending the Charter to increase the Council to seven members effective two years from now and submit this at the coming April 1 election. Councilman LaRue had checked on this, and reported Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, Fort Worth had nine members on their Council; Corpus Christi, Wichita Falls and Lubbock have seven. The Mayor stated Austin was approaching the quarter million mark in population, and seven Council Members would provide a well balanced and well represented Council. Councilman Long suggested in going to a seven member Council, that consideration be given to having a representation from north, south, east and west, and three at large, but all being voted on by the people. This would not be a ward system. Mayor Palmer stated everyone who had served on the Council had tried to look at all of Austin and tried to serve all parts of the City; and he saw no real reason for changing geographical boundaries. Councilman Long wanted to initiate an amendment for paying City Council members \$7,500 a year, and \$10,000 for the Mayor, and submit this for the people to vote on. Councilman Shanks said under the present system, there are people who are dedicated to doing something for their city; and if Council Members are paid \$7,500, every type of person would be running not for the dedication as to what they want for their city, but for the money involved. Councilman LaRue agreed. Mayor Palmer expressed his idea that a paid Council should be originated by the people through an initiative petition rather than by the Council. No Council Member in the State received any amount like this--some do receive expense accounts for direct expenses. Councilman LaRue favored a seven member Council which would provide extra council members to carry part of the load. He was very much opposed to the payment of \$7,500 to the Council Members and \$10,000 to the Mayor. There would be some tendency for individuals to seek the Council position at any cost, and to keep it at any cost, and it might not be for the benefit of the City. The general payment to Council Members throughout the State is around \$20.00 per meeting.

After discussion, Councilman Shanks moved that the Council give the people an opportunity to raise the Council number from five to seven, to be voted on at the next Election, April 1st, to take effect at the next succeeding Council election in 1969. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

Councilman Long did not object to having this issue placed before the people. Austin is growing, and it is a burden for five people to make these decisions; and in instances where it is necessary to have a four-fifths vote, if two members are out, the business is slowed down. She said since a Charter change is to be submitted it would be to the best interest of the Council in the future to submit this pay increase. The League of Women's Voters and the Jay-ees had made a study on this matter.

Councilman Long moved that a public hearing be set for next week discussing the merits of submitting a Charter amendment on April 1st concerning

the paying of City Council Members. Councilman White seconded the motion. Councilman Shanks stated this should be originated by the people and not the Council; and since the Council should not be involved in appropriating money for themselves, in giving themselves a raise; in taking advantage of the people's money out of their taxes, this proposition should be originated by the citizens themselves. He said the Council should not even suggest that the people originate it.

Roll call on Councilman Long's motion, that a public hearing be set for next week discussing the merits of submitting a Charter amendment on April 1st concerning the paying of City Council Members, lost by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, White
Noes: Councilmen LaRue, Shanks, Mayor Palmer

Councilman LaRue made the following statement:

"I am not in favor of paying the Council, and I am opposed to the present Council's even initiating a discussion for paid Council Members, particularly for the two who are probably going to run in the next City Council Election, and I would certainly not want to discuss paying Council Members at this time, since my intention has been stated that I would run for re-election and I vote 'no'."

Mayor Palmer made the following statement:

"I can certainly understand the position of any incumbent, and I would never have voted or even held a public hearing as long as I was serving on the Council. I have always felt strongly that the people of Austin have plenty of opportunity to petition this Council. I do not believe it would be accomplished at a public hearing as 100 people could be rallied who would be strongly in favor of it, but there are 220,000 people that would be involved. I would feel that the required number of people on the petition be filed with the Council concerning this type of an arrangement rather than for the Council to call a public hearing. We like to hear everybody any time on any issue, but I am not in favor of a public hearing on this particular matter; it should come from the people themselves, so I vote 'no'."

Councilman Shanks stated he had complete confidence that Austin had had good Councils in the past, and he thought in the very near future between now and the filing date that there would be other members come up and file for the Council, and there would be good candidates and good councils for the future.

DETAILS TO BE WORKED OUT IN CHARTER PROPOSITION

The City Manager stated the expansion of the Council would be good and reviewed sections where the number of Council Members involved in Council action was specifically set out; the Mayor or two members may call a meeting of the Council; a seven member Council would require four members to constitute a quorum; emergency measures now require four votes, and the ordinance could change this number to five; the place system would be numbered, Places 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7; Article III would either change the number from five to

seven, or could be omitted. As to amending an ordinance adopted by referendum or initiative process, it may be amended or repealed two years after its adoption by a four fifths vote. It was informally agreed that number be submitted as five out of seven, and that the other revisions be approved.

.

The request of Maurice Doke for approval of new plans for an apartment building and for additional waiver of inundation rights of City on Lake Austin was postponed until the following week.

.

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the erection of a boat dock on the property owned by W. R. COLEMAN, RICHARD F. BRADBERRY, RALPH MORELAND, and STERLING HOLLOWAY as described in the Travis County Deed Records and known as a tract of ground fifty (50) feet in width in the Sparks Survey as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said W. R. COLEMAN, RICHARD F. BRADBERRY, RALPH MORELAND, and STERLING HOLLOWAY to construct, maintain and operate this boat dock to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recommendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the erection of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable, and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said W. R. COLEMAN, RICHARD F. BRADBERRY, RALPH MORELAND, and STERLING HOLLOWAY has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.

(Recommendations attached)

"Austin, Texas
February 15, 1967

"Memorandum To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager
Subject: RESOLUTION, BOAT DOCK (Private)

"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of W. R. Coleman, Richard F. Bradberry, Ralph Moreland, and Sterling Holloway, owners of the property abutting on that part of Lake Austin known as Bee Creek and known as a tract of ground fifty (50) feet in width in the Sparks Survey as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately thirty-seven (37) feet beyond the normal high water

level. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recommend that if Messrs. Coleman, Bradberry, Moreland and Holloway are granted their request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions.

"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.

"(2) That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.

"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.

"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.

"Respectfully submitted,
s/ Dick T. Jordan
Dick T. Jordan
Building Official"

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

BIDS ON DECKER LAKE POWER PLANT

The City Manager stated the Electric Department would like for the Council to open bids on the Decker Lake Power Plant at 10:00 A.M., March 16th on the following:

X-129 - Line Control Panels
X-134 - Prefabricated buildings.

The Council informally agreed to this scheduling.

BIDS ON BRACKENRIDGE HOSPITAL SCHEDULED

The City Manager had a letter from the State Health Department stating the plans and specifications for Brackenridge Hospital had been approved by the State Health Department and the Federal authorities, and that bids could be taken. The Architects propose to advertise for bids on February 21st and take the bids on April 4th, and probably they will be ready for the Council on Thursday April 6th. He announced the plans were on the table in the next room.

REPORT ON LETTER FROM O.E.O.
Read February 9, 1967

The City Manager stated last week the Mayor read a letter from the Acting Regional Director of the Southwest Region, Office of Economic Opportunities, referring to a project which the City could not identify at that time. The project for which funds were to be provided was for Del Valle Schools and sent to the City for information only.

.....

The City Manager called attention to a memorandum sent out last week from the Building Official stating MR. LEO HERZOG had resigned from the Building Standards Commission. Mayor Palmer asked the Council to be ready to submit a name next week.

.....

The City Manager stated the Council had asked for a report on the pending zoning cases, and the Planning Director stated they would have a preliminary report next week. The Planning Director stated also he would like to make a report on the Workable Program soon.

U.S.S. AUSTIN

Councilman Long submitted colored pictures for the U.S.S. AUSTIN and the Council approved the selections made by Councilman Long for the mural, the two smaller pictures. She said Mr. Bill Malone had been of great assistance and had been on the U.S.S. Austin and he thought these would complement the rooms in which they will be used. The total cost will be \$250.00. Councilman Long moved that the Council accept this commission for MR. MALONE and have him finish these pictures. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Assistant City Manager suggested having the enlargements made and communicate with the Commanding Officer of the U.S.S. AUSTIN and see what his desires are about framing or installing. The Mayor stated if they are to be framed, that a statement be sent to the Council. Councilman Long moved that the money be appropriated out of the Council fund. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Council also thanked Councilman Long for all the work she had done on this. She in turn thanked MR. JAMES WILSON and MR. HARRY FRAZIER for their help.

.....

February 16, 1967

MAYOR PALMER introduced into the record a letter from Sargent Shriver, Director Office of Economic Opportunity, as follows:

"February 7, 1967

"Dear Mayor:

"At the suggestion of John Gunther, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors and Patrick Healy, Jr., Executive Director, National League of Cities, I am pleased to send you a copy of a new OEO Community Action Memorandum entitled "Revised Requirements for Representation of the Poor on the Governing Bodies of Overall Community Action Agencies." These revisions were necessary to comply with amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act enacted by the last session of Congress.

"We have worked closely with your national organizations in the preparation of these guidelines. Opportunities for review, comment and discussion by your representatives who serve on my Public Officials Advisory Council have greatly improved the final product. You will note the positive references to the role of public officials in community action:

"Representation should be included from each of the major public agencies concerned with poverty. At a minimum, the chief elected officials of the community such as the mayor or city council ... shall be represented on the governing body." (p.3)

"I look forward to your continued participation in the efforts to eliminate poverty in this Nation. Thank you for your cooperation.

"Sincerely,
s/ Sargent Shriver
Sargent Shriver
Director"

(Letter and "Revised Requirements for Representation of the Poor on the Governing Bodies of Overall Community Action Agencies" on file under OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY - Community Action)

The letter was referred to Councilman LaRue who is a member of the O.E.O. Community Council Coordinating Committee.

HOSPITAL

MAYOR PALMER read a letter regarding the case of "Linda" referring to an article in the newspaper about "Linda's" death at the Hospital. Mayor Palmer stated it needs to be pointed out that the City shares approximately \$2,000,000 a year; and the free medical services the doctors give at the Hospital, would equal this same amount approximately for care of the sick. Austin has always been a City with a heart and concerned about these kinds of cases. The Mayor cited cases coming from other counties where the City was called on to pay. He suggested that a private fund could be established that would be available. He said in light of the publicity, it appears Austin does not have a heart, and it tries desperately to take care of the ill. Councilman Long expressed regret, and hoped that through the administrators, and social workers that the referral facilities could be used. Councilman LaRue asked that the Administrator explain

GEORGE O. SLAUGHTER	1610-1616 Waterston	From "B" Residence To "C" Commercial
M. S. MARTIN	1902 University Avenue	From "B" Residence 2nd Height & Area To "C" Commercial 2nd Height & Area
FROSTEX FROZEN FOODS COMPANY, By Hub Bechtol	1013-1179A Springdale Road	From "A" Residence 1st Height & Area To "D" Industrial 6th Height & Area
JERRY KASPER By Harry E. Montandon	6206-6216 Riverside Drive 1904-1908 Montopolis Dr. 1900 Montopolis Drive 6205-6215 Kasper Street	From "A" Residence 1st Height & Area To "C" Commercial 6th Height & Area
ARTHUR GENE HOWARD	3113-3121 East 12th Street	From "C" Commercial To "C-2" Commercial
JOHN TABOR By Russell Rowland	2121-2139 Ben White Blvd. 2120-2138 Redd Street	From "A" Residence To "GR" General Retail
FRED B. WERKENTHIN, TRUSTEE	2219-2225 Swisher Street 901-909 East 23rd Street	From "BB" Residence To "C" Commercial
ROBERT L. WEIMORE By John B. Selman	1608 West 39 $\frac{1}{2}$ Street	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence
HENRY WETZEL, JR. By John B. Selman	1610 West 39 $\frac{1}{2}$ Street 3911-3913 Shoal Creek	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence
KATE NEWMAN By Jim Newman	2802-2902 Del Curto Road	From "A" Residence To "BB" Residence
TERRELL TIMMERMANN By R. J. Potts	5308-5310 Chesterfield 301 Franklin	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence
F. Y. HERRIN	1327-1329 South Congress (1311 South Congress)	From "C" Commercial 2nd Height & Area To "C-2" Commercial 2nd Height & Area
MAMIE C. BOURKE By John B. Selman	5611 Woodrow Avenue (5623 Woodrow Avenue)	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence
RICHARD POHL, ET AL By Graves, Dougherty, Gee, Hearon, Moody & Garwood	2405-2511 & 2701-2807 West 35th Street 2428-2616 & 2700-2904 West 35th Street 3413-3425 & 3501-3513 Exposition Boulevard 3418-3428 & 3500-3512 Exposition Boulevard	From "A" Residence 1st Height & Area To "LR" Local Retail 2nd Height & Area

There being no further business, Councilman LaRue moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The Council adjourned at 6:00 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED

Leota E. Palmer

Mayor

ATTEST:

Grace Monroe
Asst. City Clerk